



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/711,791	10/05/2004	Rahul SRIVASTAVA	ORCL-006/OID-2004-061-01	5790
51121	7590	12/06/2007	EXAMINER	
LAW FIRM OF NAREN THAPPETA			BASHORE, WILLIAM L	
158, PHASE ONE PALM MEADOWS, RAMAGUNDANAHALLI				
AIRPORT WHITEFIELD ROAD			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
BANGALORE, 560043			2176	
INDIA				
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			12/06/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

MN

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/711,791	SRIVASTAVA, RAHUL	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	William L. Bashore	2176	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 September 2007.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-49 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 32-40 and 46 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-31, 41-45 and 47-49 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to communications: Response to Restriction Requirement filed 9/10/2007, to the original application filed **10/5/2004**. IDS filed 12/7/2004, and 4/27/2006.
2. Claims 1-49 pending. Claims 48-49 have been added by Applicant. Claims 1, 12, 21, 32 are independent.

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

3. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 9/10/2007, and 5/28/2007 has been entered.

Election/Restrictions

4. Applicant's election without traverse of Group I (claims 1-31, 41-45, 47-48) in the reply filed on 9/10/2007 is acknowledged.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

6. **Claims 1-2, 12-13, 21-22, 41-45, 47-49 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Nielsen (hereinafter Nielsen), U.S. PG Pub No. US 2004/0205567, filed 1/22/2002.**

In regard to independent claims 1, 12, 21, 47, 49, Nielsen discloses a method of parsing a data file (an XML markup language file) typically containing a plurality of data elements (tags, etc.) (Nielsen Abstract).

Nielsen discloses receiving an XML test file for analysis inasmuch as files of said type are typically assigned file identifiers (i.e. a filename) so as to be identified by Nielsen's invention (Nielsen Abstract, paragraph [0031]).

Nielsen discloses parsing an XML file into a DOM tree, and each attribute or node in said tree is analyzed accordingly, each said node reasonably interpreted as data elements (or portion identifiers) contained within a plurality of data elements (nodes) (Nielsen paragraphs [0058], [0061], [0062]).

Nielsen discloses determining a replacement for an element node, said replacement utilizing XPath for replacing a portion of the document (i.e. a portion identifier) (Nielsen paragraphs [0052], [0062]).

Nielsen discloses an “injection mechanism” whereby a node adder for adding a node to a “location” in a DOM tree, specified by the location of the insertion (markup language) tags (Nielsen paragraph [0040]). It is respectfully noted that a typical hierarchical tree (i.e. a DOM tree) will show nodes in relative position to one another (see also Nielsen paragraphs [0050], [0069]).

Nielsen discloses the above analysis and replacement methods conducted during runtime (using an application) (Nielsen Abstract), therefore data (i.e. portion identifiers, data elements, etc.) are provided accordingly.

In regard to dependent claims 2, 13, 22, Nielsen discloses XPath (Nielsen paragraph [0052]).

In regard to dependent claims 41-45, Nielsen discloses parsing an XML file into a DOM tree, and each attribute or node in said tree is analyzed accordingly. (Nielsen paragraphs [0058], [0061], [0062]). It is noted that trees are typically traversed in node by node fashion. It is additionally noted that since a DOM tree is hierarchically based, portion identifiers are typically referenced based on a presented hierarchy in step-wise traversal.

In regard to dependent claim 48, Nielsen discloses parsing an XML file into a DOM tree, and each attribute or node in said tree is analyzed accordingly. (Nielsen paragraphs [0058], [0061], [0062]). It is noted that trees are typically traversed in node by node fashion. It is additionally noted that since a DOM tree is hierarchically based, a hierarchical path is present, originating at a root element. DOM trees are typically created and parsed in a top-down fashion (i.e. beginning of a file onward).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. **Claims 3-9, 14-20, 23-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nielsen as applied to claims 1, 12, 21 above, and further in view of Cseri et al. (hereinafter Cseri), U.S. PG Pub. No. US 2003/0046317 filed 4/19/2001.**

In regard to dependent claim 3-5, 14-16, 23-25, Nielsen does not specifically teach APIs, procedure calls, and event based parsers. However, Cseri teaches a method of incorporating binary formatting into XML utilizing parsing of an XML file into a DOM tree, along with XPath (Cseri Abstract, paragraph [0028]). Cseri teaches SAX, which is a simple API for XML, which is event based and typically comprising one or more procedure calls (Cseri paragraph [0028]). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply Cseri to Nielsen, providing Nielsen the benefit of decreasing parsing time utilizing at least in part APIs, SAX, etc.

In regard to dependent claims 6-9, 17-19, 26-29, said claims incorporate substantially similar subject matter as claimed in claims 1, 3, 12, 14, 21, 23, and in further view of the following, is rejected along the same rationale.

Nielsen does not specifically teach object oriented parsing. However, Cseri teaches object oriented programming (Cseri paragraph [0157]). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in

Art Unit: 2176

the art at the time of the invention to apply Cseri to Nielsen, providing Nielsen the benefit of object oriented programming for multiple instantiation etc.

Nielsen teaches a find request - an abbreviated version, and a get request - a non-abbreviated version of an object (Nielsen paragraph [0045]).

9. **Claims 10-11, 30-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nielsen and Cseri as applied to claims 3, 14, 23, 34 above, and further in view of Imamura et al. (hereinafter Imamura), U.S. PG Pub. No. US 2004/0261019 filed 4/1/2004.**

In regard to dependent claims 10-11, 30-31, Nielsen does not specifically teach push parsing. However, Imamura teaches parsing in association with XPath and pushing (Imamura paragraph [0160]). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply Imamura to Nielsen, providing Nielsen the benefit of pushing for more efficient parsing.

Response to Arguments

10. Applicant's arguments filed 5/28/2007 have been fully and carefully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues on pages 10-11 of the amendment that Nielsen concentrates on replacing nodes, pursuant to an XPath leading to another node. The examiner respectfully disagrees. Nielsen is also capable of creating and adding nodes via XPath as well (at least Nielsen paragraph [0040]). Nielsen will identify a node via an XPath portion identifier. Since the contents identified are part of a DOM tree,

Art Unit: 2176

locations are relative to one another in said DOM tree accordingly. The portion identifier, and its related data elements are associated accordingly.

Conclusion

11. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to William L. Bashore whose telephone number is (571) 272-4088. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:00 am - 5:30 pm EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Doug Hutton can be reached on (571) 272-4137. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

12. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

William L. Bashore
WILLIAM BASHORE
PRIMARY EXAMINER
November 25, 2007